



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CD
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/954,544	09/12/2001	Henry R. Halperin	212/220	6993

23371 7590 09/11/2003
CROCKETT & CROCKETT
24012 CALLE DE LA PLATA
SUITE 400
LAGUNA HILLS, CA 92653

EXAMINER

DEMILLE, DANTON D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3764

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/954,544	HALPERIN, HENRY R.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Danton DeMille	3764	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. **Claim 1 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meister in view of Bastyr et al.** Meister teaches a band 1, a driver mechanism 6, a cushion 3 and an automatic controller inside the driver mechanism mechanically controlling the timing of the compression and expansion cycles. The cushions 3 are attached to the inside surface of the band 1 disposed between the chest of the patient and the band 1. The cushions are located at what would be the sides of the chest of the patient and extend around the chest to the back. The cushions 3 are at least located on the sides of the chest of the patient and therefore comprehend the claimed "disposed between the chest of the patient and the band". Meister appears silent with regard to the details of the cushions 3. It is not clear what is the composition. Bastyr teaches cushion pads 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50 that are fluid filled. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Meister to use fluid filled cushions as taught by Bastyr as an obvious equivalent alternative to a foam cushion and to provide a soft cushion having a hardness and size that is variable as taught by Bastyr.

2. **Claims 2-13 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Meister.** Chang teaches a band 10 including a plurality of fluid-receiving cells 24, 26, a reciprocating pump for automatically supplying fluid under pressure to the cells. The only difference appears to be the provision of a sealed cushion between the band and the chest of the patient. Meister teaches a device for compressing the chest and the need for providing compression cushions 3 between the band and the chest of the patient. There appears to be no unobviousness to apply cushions between the patient and a band that is being constricted

around the chest of the patient dependent on practical considerations. Perhaps local injuries on the chest of the patient would preclude a band compressing the wound site. Placing cushions between the band and the chest of the patient would appear to be well within the realm of the artisan of ordinary skill. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Chang to provide compression cushions disposed between the chest of the patient and the band as taught by Meister to protect the chest of the patient from further injury and to enhance the respiration producing action of the device. Regarding claims 3, 6, 9, 12, it would have been obvious to provide a sealed cushion so that moisture from the patient does not saturate the cushion. Regarding claims 5, 8, 11, as shown in the drawing of Chang, the two fluid-receiving cells are in fluid communication with each other because the tubes 30 are linked together. The pressure will always be the same in both cells.

3. **Claims 14, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Baldwin, II.** Broadly, the band 28 of Baldwin extends around the chest of the patient. The piston 18 is operably connected to the band for contracting the band about the chest of the patient as shown between figures 5 and 6. A fluid filled cushion 32 is disposed between the chest of the patient and the band. An automatic controller 40 controls the operation of the driver mechanism. The cushion 32 is sized and dimensioned to cover substantially the entire anterior and posterior portion of the chest.

4. **Claims 2, 15, 5, 16, 8, 17, 11, 18, 20, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Cook and Bastyk et al.** In the art of constricting bands around the chest of patients Cook teaches that for the comfort of the patient cushion 15 is used around the inside of the band. This cushion 15 extends all the way around the inside of the

band and therefore would cover substantially the entire anterior portion of the chest of the patient. In the art of providing cushion on the inside of bands adapted to extend around the patient, Bastyr teaches fluid filled cushions are more desirable and an obvious equivalent alternative to foam cushions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Chang to include a cushion on the inside of the band as taught by Cook for the best comfort for the patient and to use fluid filled cushions as taught by Bastyr as an obvious equivalent alternative to foam.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 16 June 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Meister's device would squeeze the sides of the chest which would produce little if any blood flow while anterior-posterior compressions obtained with the claimed device results in significant blood flow. Whether or not the prior art is as efficient as the instant invention is not relevant. The fact that the prior art anticipates the claim limitations is. Meister's device may not be as efficient as applicant's however, Meister teaches at least one "cushion disposed between the chest of the patient and the band" as claimed. As pointed out in applicant's drawings of Meister, the cushions extend from the sides of the patient around to the anterior portion of the chest. In applicant's view the cushions may not be located about the band of the device for applicant's best result however, the fact that Meister teaches a cushion that is between the chest of the patient and the band anticipates the claimed limitation even though it may not be located in applicant's view the most effective location. There are no claim limitations in claims 1-13 that specify any specific placement. The cushions merely have to be between the chest of the patient and the band. Meister's device clearly anticipates this limitation.

Moreover, the exact location of the device during use is dependent on practical considerations of intended use. The Meister device is clearly capable of being placed at any height along the abdomen of the patient. Applicant is merely arguing the exact placement during use.

6. Applicant argues that Meister suggests no other placement of the pads however, this is not true. Meister column 2, lines 1-4 state “[e]ach compression unit [cushion] 2 is longitudinally slidably adjustably secured to the belt 1 by encircling metallic straps 5, whereby said units 2 may be disposed on the belt 1 in proper position”. Clearly, Meister teaches that the placement of the cushions along the band is adjustable so that they can be placed in proper position. Adjusting the placement of the cushions around the chest to achieve the most effective results would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

7. Applicant also argues that Meister compresses the “abdomen” of the patient however this is not accurate either. Meister column 1, lines 9-12 teaches the band is “adapted to encircle the chest diaphragm of the person to be treated.” As applicant pointed out Meister would compress the patient’s ribs preferentially with respect to the sternum. This is the chest of the patient. It is not clear how applicant can disregard Meister and somehow say this is not the chest of the patient. Again there is no claim language to somehow define over Meister regarding the placement of the band other than about the chest of the patient and clearly Meister anticipates this claim limitation. Again, arguing whether or not the band is placed high enough on the chest of the patient is dependent on intended use. There are no claim limitations that somehow require the band to be placed at a specific location on the patient. As long as the Meister band is capable of being placed on the chest of the patient, it anticipates the claimed limitations.

8. Applicant also argues that there is no motivation to combine the references. Meister teaches placing cushions between the band and the patient to protect the patient from injury from the band. Bastyr teaches placing cushions between the band and the patient to protect the patient from injury from the band. In the art of providing cushions between the band and the patient to protect the patient from injury clearly a fluid filled cushion is an obvious equivalent alternative to the foam cushions of Meister. It isn't a matter of adding something to Meister. Meister already teaches all of the element claimed. Meister appears silent with regard to the exact details of the cushions 2. It is not clear how Meister makes cushions 2. Bastyr merely provides what Meister lacks. The details of the cushions 2. Bastyr uses fluid filled cushions. Such would have been an obvious provision in Meister. It is not an inventive step to replace one type of material for another type of material when both materials are well know obvious equivalents.

9. Applicant's arguments that "Meister provides no indication that adding cushions would work in a CPR device." Applicant's position is not understood since Meister already teaches adding cushions to the device. Meister teaches cushions 2.

10. It is also not clear why applicant argues that "there is no motivation to modify Meister for use as a chest compression device." Meister's device is "for producing artificial respiration of persons who have been drowned or asphyxiated, or whose respiratory systems, because of paralysis, have need of artificial stimulation." It is not clear how applicant can disregard the teaching of Meister.

11. Applicant also argues that Chang's device is placed around the patient's abdomen. Chang clearly teaches that the method of the present invention includes "providing this high frequency ventilation by chest wall compression and expansion, trauma is avoided..." (emphasis

added) page 4, lines 18-21. As noted above with regard to Meister, the band of Chang is adapted to go about the chest of the patient just as applicant's invention. Any specific relative positioning of the band about the body of the patient is intended use. Clearly Chang's device is capable of such positioning if not already inherent.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

13. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

ddd
7 September, 2003
 (703) 308-3713
Fax: (703) 872-9302
danton.demille@uspto.gov


Danton DeMille
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3764